

Amendments to the Drawings:

Since by the present amendment the hyperlinks in the specification has been replaced as following: “aaa@abc.co.jp” with [e-mail address 1], “bbb@def.co.jp” with [e-mail address 2], “ccc@ghi.co.jp” with [e-mail address 3], the Applicant adds [e-mail address 1], [e-mail address 2] and [e-mail address 3] to the Figure 2.

REMARKS

An indication, that the drawings filed on June 12, 2001, are accepted by the Office, is noted with appreciation.

Applicant also thanks the Examiner for acknowledgment of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. §119.

The specification has been objected for the following inaccuracies: the word "reply" is misspelled in the several occurrences as "replay" and a hyperlink is used in paragraphs 29-32, 34, and 36 to 38. Additionally, the Examiner has objected the abstract for usage of legal phraseology and reference numerals. Responding to the Examiner's objections, the specification has been amended in order to eliminate the embedded hyperlinks and correct spelling errors. The appropriate corrections of the abstract have been also performed by this amendment.

Since by the present amendment the hyperlinks in the specification has been replaced as following: "aaa@abc.co.jp" with [e-mail address 1], "bbb@def.co.jp" with [e-mail address 2], "ccc@ghi.co.jp" with [e-mail address 3], the Applicant adds [e-mail address 1], [e-mail address 2] and [e-mail address 3] to the Figure 2. Therefore, Figure 2 has been corrected by this paper. No new matter is introduced by this amendment.

Claims 1 to 15 are currently active in the application. By the current amendment, claim 1 has been amended in order to emphasize the features of the present invention. The support for the amended claim 1 can be found in at least figure 1 and page 7, lines 4 to 7 of the present disclosure. Claim 2 has been amended to correct a grammatical error. New claim 15 is added and is of slightly different scope than claim 1. Support for claim 15 can be found in Figures 1 and 2 of the application. No new matter is introduced by the present amendment. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 to 4 and 6 to 8 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Dickie et al. (U.S. Patent 6,643,687). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The present invention resolves the problem of providing a secrecy of

electronic mail addresses and telephone numbers in an electronic mail transfer or telephone number transfer devices. In order to attain the secrecy of transferring of e-mail addressed and telephone numbers through an electronic mail transfer or telephone number transfer devices, according to the present invention, conversion of e-mail address to another electronic mail address for transmission is provided. Analogously, the telephone number can be stored as another telephone number for purpose of transmission.

The reference to Dickie et al. discloses an e-mail delivery system which implements proxy e-mail addresses to control access to a recipient's e-mail mailbox, and eliminates the requirement of a sender of e-mail to know the recipient's private e-mail address when sending mail. The patent to Dickie et al. aims to facilitate the automatic filtering of e-mail messages for a particular recipient so that the recipient can readily organize them according to a desired grouping. The main difference between the present invention and reference to Dickie et al. is that Dickie et al. specifies permissible e-mail interactions of each e-mail address at time of installation of the system. In other words, there is a list of possible e-mail interaction, which represents a sender and recipient pair. There is no such a list in the present invention. According to the claimed invention an electronic mail address of transmission source is converted to another electronic mail address and saved in a memory for further reference.

Rejecting claim 1, the Examiner relies on Figure 5, and column 5, lines 3 to 14 of patent to Dickie et al. However, the reference specifies the difference particularly in column 5, “ At time of installation of the email system 400, the permissible email interactions are defined for each user of the system and UI300 is generated. As earlier described, UI 300 is a list of possible email interactions, which represent a sender and recipient pair.” In contrast, according to the claimed invention, there is no listing of possible interactions and conversions of an electronic mail address of the transmission source is performed without being based on the list of possible interactions.

To emphasize the distinction, claim 1 has been amended. Specifically, claim 1 as amended recites, “An electronic mail transfer device for relaying an electronic mail transmitted from a transmission terminal through a communication

line and transferring the electronic mail thus relayed to a reception terminal, comprising:

means for converting the electronic mail address of the transmission source of the electronic mail which is transmitted from said transmission terminal through said communication line to another electronic mail address by combining electronic mail address and a message ID, which varied with every transmission destination, and then transferring the electronic mail to said reception terminal; and..." (Emphasis added)

Claim 5 has been rejected under 35 U.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Dickie et al. (U.S. Patent 6,643,687) in view of Balijepalli et al. (U.S. Patent 2004/0230566). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The reference to Dickie et al. has been distinguished above. The Examiner relied on reference to Balijepalli et al. as showing the idea of canceling the information appending to the electronic mail from said memory when the number of reply electronic mails exceeds a predetermined number. However, the rejected claim 5 indirectly depends from allowable amended claim 1 and therefore also allowable. The Examiner is respectfully requested to withdraw the rejection of claim 5 in a view of the present amendment.

For the reasons advanced, it is submitted that claims 1 to 14 clearly define over the prior art relied on by the Examiner. The prior art cited but not relied on by the Examiner has been reviewed, but for the reasons already advanced, that prior art is similarly not relevant to the invention as claimed.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the application be reconsidered, that claims 1 to 15 be allowed, and that the application be passed to issue.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

A provisional petition is hereby made for any extension of time necessary for the continued pendency during the life of this application. Please charge any fees for such provisional petition and any deficiencies in fees and credit any

Docket F-11210
Serial No.: 09/878,292

16

overpayment of fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-2041 (Whitham,
Curtis & Christofferson, P.C.).

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'M. Whitham', is written over the typed name.

Michael E. Whitham
Reg. No. 32,635

Whitham, Curtis & Christofferson, P.C.
11491 Sunset Hills Road, Suite 340
Reston, VA 20190
Tel. (703) 787-9400
Fax. (703) 787-7557
Customer No.: 30 743



FIG.2

